

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Applicant has amended Figure 1 as attached on the replacement formal drawing sheet. In Figure 1, the label --Prior Art-- has been added. Entry of the new formal drawing is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-3, 6, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin (U.S. 2004/0201952 A1). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin as applied to claims 1-3, 6, 7 and 9, and further in view of Laity (U.S. 6,488,542 B2). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin as applied to claims 1-3, 6, 7 and 9, and further in view of Fang et al. (U.S. 2005/0168925 A1).

Claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and further rewritten or amended to overcome the objection under minor informalities, set forth in the outstanding Office Action, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Amendments to Specification

Applicant has amended the Specification as noted above to cure obvious grammatical and idiomatic inaccuracies and to provide proper antecedent basis in the specification for reference numerals 1 and 11-16. It is believed that the foregoing amendments to the Specification overcome the outstanding objections thereto. No “new matter” has been added to the original disclosure by the foregoing amendments to the Specification.

Drawings

Applicant has amended Figure 1 by adding the label --Prior Art--. No “new matter” has been added to the original disclosure by the proposed amendments to these figures. It is believed the foregoing amendments obviate the outstanding objections to the drawings.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) because the reference characters 1 and 11-16 were not used in the description part of the specification. The specification has been amended, as discussed above, to provide proper antecedent basis for reference numerals 1 and 11-16. Therefore, it is not believed that any drawing corrections are necessary.

Claim Amendments

By this amendment Applicant has canceled claims 2-5 and amended claims 1 and 6 to obviate the outstanding objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. It is believed that the amended claims now specifically set forth each element of Applicant's invention in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Examiner has indicted that claim 5 would be allowed if amended or rewritten in independent form to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicant's amended claim 1 comprises a combination of original claims 1 and 5, thus redrafting claim 5 in independent form. Original claims 6-9 all depend from amended claim 1. In the absence of any art cited against Applicant's original claim 5, it is not believed that any detailed discussion of the cited prior art references is necessary. Suffice to say that all of the claims remaining in this patent application contain subject matter against which no prior art citations have been made.

New Claims

Applicant has added new claims 10-14 to this application. The new claims are believed to be patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art, taken individually or in combination. Specifically, all of the new claims require the outer body to comprise an end with at least one plug-in port for receiving at least one peripheral, and a power port located on a bump at the outer body of the PC CardBus such that the power port is disposed inwardly from opposite lateral sides of the outer body. This is clearly illustrated in Applicant's Figure 2, wherein it can be seen that the power port 361 is disposed inwardly of the opposite lateral sides of the outer body 31 of the PC CardBus 3.

New claims 11-14 all are directly dependent from claim 10 and add various other features corresponding to original claims 7-9.

The primary reference to Lin discloses a card converter connector wherein a power port 27 is located on a lateral side of the CardBus. Clearly, Lin can not be said to teach the location of the power port inwardly from opposite lateral sides of the CardBus, as now specifically required by Applicant's claims 10-14. Thus, Applicant submits that the subject matter of claim 10-14 is neither specifically shown, nor intimate in any fashion whatsoever by the cited prior art. Given this

complete lack of disclosure, no combination of the cited prior art references could possibly render obvious Applicant's new claims 10-14.

Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 29, 2006

By:


Bruce H. Troxell
Reg. No. 26,592

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404
Falls Church, Virginia 22041
Telephone: 703 575-2711
Telefax: 703 575-2707